

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, Applicants appreciate the acknowledgment of allowable subject matter contained in claims 6-10 and 17.

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. In response, Applicants amended the claims to clarify that the magnetoresistive transducer has first and second lead layers, and request withdrawal of the rejection on this basis.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gill (U.S. Patent No. 5, 872,689). In response, Applicants amended claim 1 to further recite a first lead layer spreading over a surface of one of the domain control layers without contacting the other domain control layer, and a second lead layer spreading over a surface of the other domain control layer without contacting the one of the domain control layers, and respectfully traverse.

Gill discloses a first lead L1 (100) and a second lead L2 (110) in FIG. 3. The first lead L1 spreads over both surfaces of the thin film biasing layers 120 and 130. Similarly, the second lead L2 spreads over both surfaces of the thin film biasing layers 120 and 130. This structural relationship between the first and second leads L1 and L2 and the thin film biasing layers 120 and 130 is different from the structural relationship between the first and second lead layers and the domain control layers of the present invention.

In the present invention, as now recited in the amended claims, first and second lead layers are defined. The first lead layer spreads over the surface of one of the domain

control layers without contacting the other domain control layer. The second lead layer spreads over the other domain control layer without contacting the domain control layer in contact with the first lead layer. That is, there is a structural relationship between the first and second lead layer in the domain control layers that is in a one-to-one correspondence. Gill fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Moreover, since there is no substantial change to the scope of the invention, Applicants believe that no new issues are raised by this amendment, and therefore respectfully request entry of the amendment and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of claim 1 and its depending claims 2-3 for the reasons recited above.


Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gill. Since claims 4-5 ultimately depend upon claim 1, they necessarily include all of the features of their associated independent claim plus other additional features. Thus, Applicants submit that the §103 rejection of claims 4-5 has also been overcome for the same reasons mentioned above to overcome the rejection of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the §103 rejection of claims 4-5 also be withdrawn.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Joseph P. Fox

Registration No. 41,760

September 17, 2004

300 South Wacker Drive - Suite 2500

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Telephone: (312) 360-0080

Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

Customer Number 24978